



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

anything more strenuous than drawing their salaries", that there was no packet service till 1755, that Rhode Island ever sent over her laws for inspection, that governors' vice-admiralty commissions came directly from the Admiralty, or that conflict between a colonial law and the law of England was considered sufficient ground for repeal. But most of these slips must be passed by, as they count for little against the genuine merits of the work.

The most serious blunder lies in the choice of a title. The work has nothing to do with "American Colonial Government". The contents are accurately expressed only by the subtitle. It is a pity that the author has not carried his subject to 1782, for he has omitted an extremely interesting and important period in the history of the board.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

The First American Civil War: First Period, 1775-1778, with chapters on the Continental or Revolutionary Army and on the Forces of the Crown. By HENRY BELCHER, Rector of S. Michael-in-Lewes, Sussex. In two volumes. (London and New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. Pp. xxiv, 350; viii, 364.)

THIS work is plainly written as an antidote to Trevelyan and other "Whig disciples of Clio", to use Mr. Belcher's own phrase. It seeks "to probe the weakness and the futilities of the Bancroft school of history". But why this second operation after the one so skillfully performed by Sydney George Fisher? It suggests incompetent diagnosis. We are only moved to mirth like that of the Swedish hero of a well-known modern fable. The whole work is argumentative in character and not historical either in spirit or construction. The author has not searched for the truth so much as for facts with which to confound the Whigs. Truth is desirable as an ornament, but sarcasm is indispensable. American ancestors, he declares, figure in American histories "as clad in shining garments and with features not merely deftly coloured, but enamelled with chipless enamel". Yet when he wishes to establish unpleasant facts about America's past, his particular joy is to convict the Americans out of their own mouths by quoting Roosevelt, Lodge, "Professor Sloane, of Princeton", and Sydney George Fisher, whose book is a perfect gold-mine for this seeker after Yankee defects. Mr. Belcher has a fine nose for the carrion of Whig outrages, and his researches in this direction are remarkably complete if not critical. His use of history for argumentative purposes leads to digressions worse than those of *Tristram Shandy*. Although the second volume brings the history down only to the close of Burgoyne's campaign, yet the treaty of peace appears on page 23 of the first volume. Up and down American history he rages from Pocahontas to Roosevelt seeking facts to support his adverse opinions. After the siege of Boston, he brings the scene of the war to New York by going back to the Stamp Act, and coming on for a time,

he again harks back to Captain Kidd to whose example he attributes the character of the waterside population in New York during the Revolution. Soon the demands of his argument bring him up to present-day New York and its large Jewish population. Then he hastens back to Hendrick Hudson, while he traces the causes of New York's peculiar attitude toward the Revolution. A diagram tracery of his advance and retreat on the field of history would resemble the diagram of a hard-fought foot-ball game. He rakes New England's history from Salem Witchcraft to the destruction of Hutchinson's mansion in order to convict its worthy Puritans of intolerance, riotous conduct, and hypocrisy. Grim pleasure is taken in the assertions that it was death to say mass in New England, that Indians were burned alive for heresy, that Faneuil Hall was built by a slave-trader, that the Mayflower began as a whaler, then bore the Pilgrims to America, and ended as a slaver. He twists Massachusetts with slavery, and particularly loves to rail at John and Samuel Adams and Benjamin Franklin. He never fails while "beating the bones of the buried" to take a fling at Cromwell. The "lurid rhetoric of the Declaration of Independence" does not, of course, escape his sneer, nor does the "fuss" over the Boston Massacre. The Spanish Fury, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Sicilian Vespers have not altogether "loosened so many capable tongues". This is but one of the many cases where Mr. Belcher's exaggeration becomes merely amusing, for while there is much sarcasm and some wit, there is no sense of humor. Some sharp criticisms are all too true but there is no sympathetic understanding of the frontier conditions which account for many of the worst evils. The author expects the conduct of a Chesterfield from the rude dweller on the margin of America's forests. Of actual error there is no great amount. The date of the Albany Congress is not 1753, Portsmouth (where the Russo-Japanese treaty was made) is not in Maine, there is obviously no proof for the positive assertion that not one-tenth of the tea imported to America paid duty, a statement by Walker, in the *Making of the Nation*, is not "irrefutable proof". Now and then, for a tricksy word the author defies the matter, as when he defines the Committees of Correspondence as "secret vigilant societies of the Mafia type". Finally he misses entirely the most important phases of the American Revolution, the great revolution in political practice which went on *pari passu* with the war.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

A History of the President's Cabinet. By MARY L. HINSDALE, Ph.D.
(Ann Arbor: George Wahr. 1911. Pp. ix, 355.)

THERE was real need for a volume such as Miss Hinsdale has written. The literature of merit dealing with the President's Cabinet is notably meagre, considering the importance of the Cabinet as an institution of government. The book under review, one of the *University of Michigan*